

# JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO

---

Volume III

OCTOBER, 1919

Number 2

---

## THE ANAPHORA OF OUR LADY MARY<sup>1</sup>

Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

### ḲEDDĀSĒ MĀRYĀM

ANAPHORA OF OUR LADY MARY MOTHER OF GOD, COMPOSED BY  
ABBA HERYAKŌS, OF THE CITY OF BEHENSĀ. *May his prayer and  
his blessing be with his beloved son Gīyōrgīs for ever and ever. Amen.*

### <THE INTRODUCTION>

My heart is inditing of a good matter; my heart is inditing of a good matter; my heart is inditing of a good matter; and I will set forth the *Ḳeddāsē* of Mary, not for the many, but for the few; and I will proclaim the praise of the Virgin, not with a multiplicity of senseless words, but with brevity; and I will set forth the greatness of the Virgin. And now I will stand in humility and in love this day in the presence of this august mystery, and before this table and eucharist, a sacrament indeed, whereof the impure in spirit cannot taste. Unlike the sacrifices of the fathers of old, with blood of sheep, and goats, and bulls. But this is fire; fire which giveth life to the upright of heart, to those who do his will, a consuming fire to the wicked who deny his name; a fire indeed which the fiery ones, the Cherubim and Seraphim, who are a flame of fire, cannot touch. Therefore will we love thee, O Mary, and magnify thee, because for us thou hast given birth to the food of very righteousness. O ye ancient fathers, consecrated by imposition of hands, appointed to succeed the Apostles, we take you as our intercessors with God, day

<sup>1</sup> Mercer, *MS. Eth.* 3, 114a-131b.

by day, these two, the pope abba *Matthew* of the great city of Alexandria, and the head of the city of our fathers, the blessed pope abba *Peter*.

<THE INTERCESSION>

*The deacon shall say*

For the sake of the blessed one, happy, and glorified in all things, our blessed and pure lady, the Mother of God, Mary the Virgin.

For the sake of the holy, blessed, spirits, the heavenly archangels, and the powers, and the blessed and serene guide John the Baptist.

For the sake of the holy, blessed ministers, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the evangelists.

For the sake of thy holy servants, Peter and Paul, James and John, Andrew, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, Thaddeus and Simeon, and Mātyān, the twelve apostles, and James the apostle, the brother of our Lord, bishop of Jerusalem, holy and blessed Stephen, head of the deaconate, and first martyr.

For the sake of all the saints and martyrs, who rest in the orthodox faith: Paul, Timothy, Silas, and Barnabas, Titus, Philemon, and Clement, the seventy-two disciples, the five hundred companions, the three hundred and eighteen Orthodox. For us and for them all, remember them, O Lord, especially the blessed and holy archpope abba *Matthew*, that thou mayest preserve them during their lifetime, and that thou mayest save them and forgive them their sins; and that thou mayest be merciful to us who pray, for ever and ever. Amen.

*The priest shall say*

For us and for them all, O advocate, do thou intercede with thy Son, that he may give rest to the souls of all popes, archpopes, presbyters, and deacons, who rightly direct the way of the Word; of kings, and judges, and leaders, and those who were in authority; and young men, and virgins, and monks, rich and poor, great and lowly, the widow and the orphan, the stranger and the poor, and all Christian people who are at rest, of the Christian congregations, most especially on behalf of those who sleep in this place, on their behalf do thou oft intercede, to refresh their souls; for wherever be the place that is designated as that of victorious martyrs, and the



place of the blessed elect, and the place of thy vigilant angels, in every place thou art head, and powerful is thy name with God.

*The deacon shall say*

Rise up ye who are seated.

*The priest shall say*

Let us arise in the fear of God that we may magnify and praise her who is full of praise, uttering a salutation of joy to her who is full of grace. Greater the majesty of aspect in thee than the majesty of the Cherubim of many eyes, and the Seraphim of eight wings.

*The deacon shall say*

Look to the east.

*The priest shall say*

Verily God the Father hath beheld from heaven the east and the west, the north and the south, and searched diligently in all ends thereof, and found none like thee; and was pleased with thy sweet odour, and loved thy beauty, and sent his Son to thee whom he loved.

*The deacon shall say*

We look.

*The priest shall say*

Holy is God the Father who is well pleased with thee. Holy is the only-begotten Son who dwelt in thy womb. Holy is the paraclete, the Holy Ghost, who sanctified thee.

*The deacon shall say*

Respond.

*The priest shall say*

O Virgin, full of praise, whereunto shall one liken thee. Thou art the loom out of whom Emmanuel put on the inexplicable clothing of the body. He made the warp of thy original flesh; and his shuttle was the Word, Jesus Christ, and his reed, Jesus was from the overshadowing of the high God, and the weaver the Holy Ghost. O marvellous and hard saying! By the tables which thou spreadest, the fathers of old passed from death to life. Thou wast the hope of

Adam when driven forth from the garden, the meekness of Abel who was slain by violence, the goodness of Seth, the deeds of Enoch, the ark of Noah wherein he was saved from the evil deluge, the blessing of Shem and the portion of Lot, the pilgrimage of Abraham, the fragrance of Isaac, the ladder of Jacob, the consoler of Joseph, the tables of Moses, the bush at Sinai, the bell which was on the robe of Aaron, the priest, the rod that sprouted, and blossomed, and bare fruit; the column of testimony of Joshua, the fleece of Gideon, the vessel of ointment, the horn of Chrism of Samuel, the root of Jesse wherein he gloried, the chariot of Aminadab, the harp of David, the crown of Solomon; a fruitful garden, and a sealed well; he sent thee as Elijah's cruse of gold, and the vessel of Elisha; the pregnancy, pattern of virginity, the pregnancy spoken of by Isaiah; the primogeniture without cohabitation of Daniel, the Mount Paran of Habakkuk, the fruitful east of Ezekiel, the coming one of Haggai, the Bethlehem and land of Ephratah of Micah, the tree of life of Zephaniah, the healer of wounds of Nahum the prophet, the rejoicing of Zechariah, the purified temple of Malachi!

O Virgin, parable and prophecy of the prophets, grace of the apostles, mother of martyrs, sister of angels, glory of youths, virgins, and monks, who watch within her gates day and night.

O Virgin, not in base concupiscence wast thou conceived, but of the legitimate embraces of Anna and Joachim wast thou born.

O Virgin, not amid pastimes didst thou grow up, like the daughters of the Hebrews, who are stiffnecked, but in the holy temple, and in sanctity and in purity didst thou live.

O Virgin, it was no earthly bread on which thou wast nourished, but heavenly bread of heavenly make.

O Virgin, it was no earthly drink which thou didst drink, but spiritual drink was poured out of the heavens.

O Virgin, who knewest not pains like women before thee and since, but in sanctity and in purity wast thou delivered.

O Virgin, no deceitful youths were thy comforters, but angels of heaven visited thee, when the priests contended about thee, the high priest praised thee.

O Virgin, thou wast not betrothed to Joseph that thou mightest know him, but that he might preserve thee in purity. For thus it was. When God the Father saw thy purity, he sent an angel of



light unto thee whose name was Gabriel, and he said to thee, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. Then came unto thee the inseparable word out of his Father's bosom. Thou didst become pregnant with him who cannot be comprehended. He who was covered in thy womb; he whose height cannot be measured, to whose depth no addition can be made, dwelt in thy womb. The fire of God, which can neither be perceived nor measured, dwelt in thy womb. It is not right that we should compare the fire of God with the earthly fire that can be measured. It is impossible that God should be described. This sufficeth, and it is a likeness.

God is not a sphere like the sun or moon, nor weary like a man; but he is wonderful, and sitteth on high, whither thought of man hath not reached, nor knowledge of angel extended.

God hath not length and breadth, height and depth, right and left, but filleth all in all.

God hath not extension nor contraction, but only as his Godhead is proclaimed in all lands.

God hath no roof over him, nor foundation under him.

God does not lower nor humble his head, that he may take up from the earth anything that is on it, but he holdeth all things in his hand as he showed to Peter.

God hath no breast which is in front, nor back which is behind, by which he is revealed and made manifest, but is veiled in a flame of fire; a flame of fire is he. We believe in the Father as the sender, that he is a Father in his person.

We believe in the Holy Ghost, the life-giver, that he is a Holy Spirit in his person, three names, one God. Not like Abraham who was older than Isaac, and Isaac who was older than Jacob. Not so with God: the Father is not older than the Son, and the Son is not older than the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost is not younger than the Son, and the Son is not younger than his Father. Not as Abraham who laid commands on Isaac in legal manner, nor as Isaac who laid commands on Jacob. Not thus it is with God: the Father lays not commands upon the Son because of his essence; the Son and the Holy Ghost are equal in Godhead; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one God; one kingdom, and one power, and one tribunal.

The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost sing; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost speak; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are well pleased; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost deliberate; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost meditate; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost fulfill; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost create; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost conjoin; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost fashion; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost send; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost exercise power; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost witness; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost draw; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost teach; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost admonish; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost purify; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost refine; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost sanctify; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost strengthen; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost make constant; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost crown; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost vest; the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost give grace; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost take their seat; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost judge; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost examine. Thus do we believe, and thus do we confess the union and conjunction, but not dividing nor separating them lest there be a diversity, yet, dividing and separating lest there be a confusion. Not that we say there are three, like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but he is one in a trinity of subsistence; not that we say he is one like Adam, the beginning of all creation, but he is three in one subsistence. Behold we have heard of the profane Jews and erring Ishmaelites, who say that God is absolutely one, in their ignorance; for they are blind of heart. Behold, we regard them as pagan idolaters, who have many gods and many demons. We follow the guides in a good path, even as the apostles have taught us, saying, the Father is a sun, the Son is a sun, the Holy Ghost is a sun, one sun of righteousness, which shineth upon all; the Father fire, the Son fire, the Holy Ghost fire, one fire of life which is from above; the Father a dayspring, the Son a dayspring, and the Holy Ghost a dayspring, one splendour which by the brightness of its light hath scattered the darkness; the Father



a vine, the Son a vine, and the Holy Ghost a vine, one wine of life by which all the world is made sweet; the Father milk, the Son milk, and the Holy Ghost milk, one milk without commixture. Thus do we believe and thus do we confess, and say the Prayer of Faith.

Let us now return to the beginning of the discourse, and let us enquire of the holy Virgin as to her conception, which is so marvellous to all people. O Virgin, where dwelt within thy womb the devouring fire, whose countenance is fire, and whose clothing is fire, and whose time was fire? How were the seven coverings not burned? The fire which burned, whither did it go, and where was it infixed, and where was it expanded in thy womb? On thy side on the right hand, and on thy side on the left, whereas thou wast but a small body, was the fire — encompassed cherubic throne. Where was it prepared and where was it placed within thy womb, who wast but a little betrothed one? She was a mother, and yet a handmaid; pregnant without cohabitation, like a bee, as the story saith; milk united with virginity. While I think on these things my mind desires to swim in the depths of the ocean of thy Son, but the waves of the secrets of thy beloved one overwhelm it. Yea, when I think on this, my mind desires to mount on high, and bring forth the secret, and to pluck away the veil that enshroudeth the living one, but it bears the flame of fire, and attaineth not unto the measure of half of the half of the heavens; yea, when I muse on this, my thoughts desire to ride upon the wings of the wind, and fly to the east and west, to the north and to the south, and into all parts; and in its flight to behold the nature of things created, and to measure the depths of the seas, and to scan the height of the heaven, and to penetrate the universe; but it cannot be, and the mind returneth to the place where it was at first. And now we will not investigate his depths, nor scrupulously enquire into his majesty; for the tongues of prophets and apostles cannot praise the extent of his greatness, Awful is he, and there is no place for irreverence towards him, and yet he humbleth himself unto us. He is too high to be attained unto, and yet he took, with us, the form of a servant. He is a fire which cannot be touched; yet we have seen him, and handled him, and eaten and drunk with him. And now we will praise him by saying, "Holy"; *at day-break*, "Holy," etc.

*Then finally the priest shall say*

O Virgin, O fruitful one who art eaten, and fountain who art drunk! O bread which is of thee, for those who eat thereof in faith, it is goodness, and life, and salvation! O bread which is of thee! To those who eat thereof in faith, it is mighty, invincible; for its strength is of adamant! O cup which is of thee, for those who drink thereof in faith, it instructeth in wisdom and addeth life! O cup which is of thee, for those who drink thereof not in faith, it maketh drunk, it stupifieth, causeth to reel, and addeth sin instead of the remission of sin. And now, we will offer praise, saying — and all by law of man — Praise be to thy kingdom! Praise with pure incense we will offer unto thee.

## &lt;THE INSTITUTION&gt;

*Then he offers the incense*

Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, from whom proceedeth every good gift and every perfect present, became man, and performed every work of man, except only sin, and was instructed in the law of the Hebrews, was baptized by John, and was tempted in the desert, hungered and thirsted, and wrought miracles. On that night in which he delivered his soul up to death, he showed his disciples the many marvels of his crucifixion, and passion, and death, and resurrection on the third day in the flesh and spirit, with bones and blood, as he was at first. Then the disciples were with him on his right hand and on his left; and with them was numbered, after the manner of the tares mingled with the wheat, Judas who betrayed the Lord.

Then Jesus Christ took bread into his holy hands, blessed, pure, and without spot; looking up towards heaven, to thee, his Father, he intercedeth for his mother recommending to deliver her from all evil.

*The priest shall say*

We believe, etc.

*The priest shall say*

He the blessed one blessed, he the holy one brake, and gave to his disciples, and he said to them: "Take, eat, this bread is my body, which is broken for you, for the redemption of the whole world."



*The people shall say*

Amen. Amen. Amen.

*The priest shall say*

Likewise, receiving the cup after they had eaten, he said: "Take, drink, from the cup, my blood which the spear poured out for you."

*The people shall say*

Amen. Amen. Amen.

*The priest shall say*

"And whenever ye do this ye make memorial of me, and commemorate my death and resurrection."

*The people shall say*

We commemorate, etc. O Lord, as then, bless, and break, and distribute this bread. Amen.

<THE INVOCATION>

*The priest shall say*

O Lord, as then, sign, sanctify, and distribute this cup. Amen. And this my priestly function do thou purify, approve, and accept.

*The priest shall say*

And this priest who is with me do thou help in this mystery. Make us, both him and me, like Joseph and Nicodemus, who wrapped up thy body. And this deacon who ministereth unto thee according to the law of the ministry, do thou advance to the higher dignity of our priesthood, and make him full of grace, and righteousness, and favour, like Stephen, who beheld the very Trinity, who gazed upon and rejoiced at the descent of the Holy Ghost. Amen, etc.

*Here the deacon rejoiceth*

And this people who are gathered together in this holy Church, with priests, and deacons, great and small, make them meet for the

reception of thy holy mystery. Have mercy and rebuke not, O Lord. Have mercy upon us, O Christ, etc.

*The deacon shall say*

Upon all, etc.

*The priest shall say*

This signifieth the body and the blood.

*The priest shall say*

Vouchsafe union with thyself to all those who partake of it, that it may be to them for life and praise for ever and ever.

*The priest shall say as before*

*The priest shall say*

Give us union.

<THE INCLINATION>

*The deacon shall say*

Stand up for prayer.

*The people shall say*

Lord have mercy upon us.

*The priest shall say*

Peace be to you all.

*The people shall say*

With thy spirit.

*The priest shall say the Prayer of Breaking*

O God, maker of all things, giver of all things, container of all things, fulfiller of all things, whom angels and archangels worship, powers and dominions, might and strength, the sun, and moon, and stars, and all grades; for from the beginning subjection, majesty, and dominion are his. He who was rich in all made himself poor in all. Love drew down the mighty Son from his throne, and brought him even to death. O victim, who resisted not those who dragged him along, and bent his neck to those who slaughtered him! O lamb, who was dumb before his shearers! O patience, who opened not his mouth in his suffering, before those who smote him! O



bread, who came forth from the treasure which Joseph bought, and found therein the precious gem of the onyx! O chalice, who came forth from the virginal chamber! This sign of the cross, which is separate from the bread, is not separate or different; the form, and softness, and taste are one. As the form of this sign of the cross is not separate nor different from the bread, in like manner his deity is not separate nor diverse from his humanity. And thus he is not separate nor diverse. This sign of the cross is not separate from the bread. Thus thy majesty was commingled with our lowliness, and our lowliness with thy majesty, O Lord our almighty God.

<THE LORD'S PRAYER>

*The deacon shall say*

Pray.

*The people shall say*

Our Father who art in heaven.

*The priest shall say*

Now let us hear this word of eucharistic consecration to our latest breath. In it let us seek refuge; in it let us find reconciliation; and in it let us make our boast; for it is the coming of the Son out of the heaven of heavens for judgment and for mercy; so that this bread is both a refuge and a tribunal, and also the merciful one. At this perturbing word the soul trembleth, and my members quake, and the doors of my heart within me are opened. Behold, this divine bread is broken! Behold, this sacred chalice is prepared! Let him who will receive come. But first of all bow your heads, and purify your souls. If any be unclean, let him withdraw. If any one fall into sin, let him not forget it, for it is not forgotten. If any one hath habitually lightly esteemed this sacrament, let him not draw nigh; he is forbidden. This bread which is seen is not as earthly bread; it is the fire of the Godhead. Where is the mouth that can feed on this bread? Where are the teeth that may masticate this bread? Where is the stomach that shall contain this bread? Let us now, therefore, say,

*The people shall say*

According to thy mercy, O our God, and not according to our offences, etc.

*The priest shall say*

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world, even the body and the blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world, in the faith of him Mary followed.

<THE INCLINATION>

*The deacon shall say*

Stand.

*The priest shall say*

To thee, O Lord, the maker of all things, to the invisible God, we stretch forth our souls. To thee, the humbler of all things, we humble ourselves; to thee, the adored of all, we adore; to thee we subject ourselves, who dost subject all things to thyself. O thou revealer of hidden things, and concealer of all which is manifest! O thou who bringest forth that which is within, and hidest that which is without, hear now the cry of thy people who call upon thee in righteousness.

*The deacon shall say*

Worship.

*The priest shall say the Prayer of Penitence*

<MANUAL ACTS>

*The deacon shall say*

Give we heed.

*The priest shall say*

The Lord be with you.

*The deacon shall say*

Pray for them.



*The priest shall say*

O thou supreme one, my king and my God! O blessed and glorified for ever and ever! Every day I bless thee and praise thee, thou glorified one, for ever and ever.

<THE COMMUNION>

*The priest shall say*

Praise be to God, etc., *after placing the oblation*

*The priest shall say*

And now, O Christian people, as ye are gathered together on this day, so shall God gather you in Jerusalem, the place of freedom, in the heavens; and as ye have heard the voice of Mary's liturgy, so shall God cause you to hear in Mount Zion the voice of the harp of his children, and the song of the angels which bedews the very bones, and by its abundant sweetness ravishes the heart exceedingly. Thither shall he bring you, where is set up the tabernacle that burns with fire, and where the high priest Jesus Christ abideth. There is the image of that face portrayed, and the pure crown, and the radiant robes; the work of no human hand, but of celestial texture. To the congregation of holy prophets he shall bring you, and to the congregation of blessed apostles, and to the congregation of fervent martyrs, and to the congregation of the blessed just, and to the congregation of the established priests, and to the congregation of the vigilant messengers, and to the congregation of virgins, and perfect monks, with all the perfect, and to the congregation of the one, holy, apostolic, Christian Church, and among them is the adorned *tabôt*, our lady, Mary. Let us not seek our adornment of the greatness and vainglory which is clad in death, and goeth down to Sheol. Let us possess, therefore, lowliness which is with purity, and not merely purity of the body; for in perfectness of spirit did the prophets see God, and behold him face to face. Let us possess humility like the apostles; for with humility God endued them, and power to bind and loose all the bands of sin. Let us possess the gift of reticence and patience, like Mary, whom the Lord praised, when he said, Mary hath chosen the good part, and it shall not be taken away from her. And now let us ask for the gracious grace of the Lord our God.

## &lt;THE THANKSGIVING AND BENEDICTION&gt;

*The deacon shall say*

Pray.

*The priest shall say*

O Virgin remind him though he forgetteth nought. Remind him, O Virgin, of his birth, wherein he was born in Bethlehem, and was wrapped in swaddling clothes; and how they warmed him, in the days of winter, with the breath of the ass and the ox. Remind him, O Virgin, of his journey with thee, when thou fleddest with him from city to city in the days of Herod the king. Remind him, O Virgin, of the tears of sorrow which flowed from thine eyes, and ran down upon the beloved cheek of thy Son. Remind him, O Virgin, of the hunger and thirst, of the hardships, and of all the sadness which came upon thee with him. Remind him of mercy and not wrath. Remind him of compassion and not death. Remind him of sinners and not of the righteous. Remind him of the polluted and not of the pure. And now let us praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and world without end. Amen.

*Imposition of hands*

Let us give thanks to God for all which he has given and conferred upon his mother in this *Ḳeddāsē*. For he of his good pleasure hath caused us to worship and celebrate. To him be glory even for ever and ever.

And I have seen one who said falsely: this *Ḳeddāsē* which the priest celebrates — it is not Mary whom he sanctifies, but he sanctifies himself, for Mary is holy. The Lord hath taught it by prayer to Mary. This is the writing of her scribe *Walda Giyörgīs* for ever and ever. Amen.



## A NEO-BABYLONIAN GRAMMATICAL SCHOOL TEXT

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, New York City

IN his *Early Babylonian History* (p. 330), Radau gave a short description of two neo-Babylonian tablets of the Hoffmann Collection numbered by him 197 and 198. Apparently, he did not notice that 200 is a missing part of 198. These tablets are light brown, carefully written and artistically adorned with lines of wedges. Both are duplicates of the work of some literary and devout Babylonian scribe who wrote on the obverse short extracts from Syllabaries A and B, from the great List of Gods *AN* = *Anum* and from the lexicographical series *gar-ra* = *hubullu*. The reverse is entirely destroyed on 198 + 200 and appears in a damaged condition on 197. Enough can be deciphered to show that the extracts from grammatical and allied texts were offered for the life and health of a certain man and his family. It is interesting to find that in Babylon anything connected with writing was *per se* sacred, whether it contained religious literature or astronomic data (as in the treatise edited by King, CT 33, 1-8) or grammatical texts (as in the case of the texts here studied). We have to this day survivals of this attitude in the high respect paid by Arab-speaking Moslems to any scrap of paper bearing Arabic characters.

The obverse of 197 has in col. I the sign *BAD* fifteen times. Then in col. II we have the first six signs of syllabar A, namely *A*, *SUR*, *PAD*, *HAR*, *AH*, 'A. (Cf. CT XI, 1, I 1-9 and CT V 9 I 1-6) followed twice by *TUK*. This *TUK* is omitted in 198, which is quite correct for the text continues with Syl. A V 40-54,<sup>1</sup> *BAD*, *AZAG*, *AZAG-UD*, *DUMU*, *DUMU-US*, *UN* (the two last on 198 only). Both texts omit (*Sa-a*) *gišimmaru*. These signs are broken away at the end of CT V 9 rev. II. THUREAU-DANGIN, using CT V 9 rev. IV has shown that Syl. B<sup>1</sup> (CT XI 34-35 = DELITZSCH AL<sup>5</sup> 107-112) began with *á* = *A* = *nâku*, to wail, which is the catch-line of Syl. A. (Cf. ZA XV 165). It is therefore certain that Syl. B

<sup>1</sup> Numbering after DELITZSCH, AL<sup>5</sup> p. 48.

followed immediately Syl. A and was therefore part of the series  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$ . Syl. B<sup>1</sup> is the first tablet of that series. The Hoffmann texts supply the first nine signs of  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$  already known from CT V 9 rev. IV.<sup>2</sup> These signs from A to ZA begin the Yale syllabary (cf. Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions* p. xl.) After ZA follows ZA - *tenû* or slanted ZA and SUR. According to a variant in Berlin Syl. B<sup>1</sup> (First tablet of  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$ , ended with  $\acute{g}al = pirištu$  with catch-line AN = *šamû*. The latter is the first line of Syl. B. (CT XI 14-18 = AL<sup>5</sup> 95-106). Moreover EAH 197 gives us the first six signs of Syl. B, thus showing concretely that *Syllabar B followed B<sup>1</sup> and was the second Tablet of  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$* . The signs given in EAH 197 are AN (twice), NAB, MUL, UR (twice) and UR (*minnabi*) or UR-*minnabi-gilim*, namely UR crisscrossed as given in Weissbach, *Miscellen*, pl. X. Then follows DUN or the *gunu-šeššig* of UR = *dêpu*. The variant EAH 198 has the simple *gunû* or NIMGIR first, as Weissbach's text. Then follows NE twice (four times on EAH 198).

Syllabar B or rather the second tablet of  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$  has the catch line AN = <sup>ilu</sup>Anum, a series of at least nine tablets (CT 24, 1-18). These tablets are not identical in form to  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$  and they insert Sumerian readings only as glosses. We must admit however, that in some way the series AN = <sup>ilu</sup>Anum was connected with the syllabaries. Indeed the Hoffmann tablets give the first lines of AN = Anum after the first lines of Syllabar B, as follows:

<sup>ilu</sup> A-nu-um	Cf. CT 24, 1, 1; 19, 1; 20, 1
An-tum	CT 24, 1, 2
<sup>ilu</sup> En-lil (EAH 198)	CT 24, 5, 38, 39
<sup>ilat</sup> Nin-lil	CT, 24, 5 K. 4333, 6
<sup>ilu</sup> Nusku	2 Rawl. 59 a 13-15
<sup>ilat</sup> Sa-dâr-nun-na	2 Rawl. 59 a 16
<sup>ilu</sup> Gibil	CT 24, 30, 118
<sup>ilu</sup> Ne-(gun)	CT 24, 26, 32 (here falsely DAR for GUN)
<sup>ilat</sup> Nin-el-la	CT 24, 26, 113

EAH 197 reads in the third line <sup>ilu</sup>En-tum by homotelouton.

<sup>2</sup> Note that before GA-KASKAL of this text, GA or even GA-GA should be restored (from the Chicago Syllabary I, 22-29; cf. Luckenbill, *AJSL* 33, 172.



Another proof of our statement on the series  $AN = \text{il}^u \text{Anum}$  is that tablet V of the series  $\acute{a} = A = n\acute{a}ku$  (BM 93038 = CT 12, 16-17) is called the fifth *pīrsu* or extract. Cf. colophon p. 17. Tablet 12 is BM 92693 = CT 12, 1-3. Tablet 14 is BM 93035 = CT 12, 4-5. Tablets 17 and 18 or 18 and 19 are BM 93037 and 92692 = CT 12, 6-9. Tablet 39 is BM 92691 = CT 12, 10-11. It becomes evident that syllabary B was only the first two tablets of a huge lexicographical treatise on the signs which were first listed with reference to their forms and then treated (in a different order) at great length in the series.

The Hoffmann tablet gives after that nine lines of the series *gar-ra* = *hubullum*. Rm 2, 428 which supplies the top of K. 4315 = II Rawl. 39, No. 4 also gives us the beginning of Tablet I of this series. The Hoffmann tablet supplies the lines of Col. I broken away at the top of II Rawl. 39, No. 4. It reads

gar-ra	= hu-bul-tum, money loaned for interest (usually hubullu)
es-še-de-a-an	= hu-bu-ut-ta-tum, money loaned without interest
šu-lal	= kip-tum, a loan (EAH 198)
še-bal	= šu-pil-tum, exchange
nig-ba	= kiš-tum, gift
in-na-an-ba	= i-ki-iš, he gave
a-mu-un-na-ġal	= iš-rug, he gave
ba-dū	= i-pu-uš, he made
ba-an-bal	= ih-ri, he dug

We note that in the second line EAH 198 has *še-eš-de-a* (omitting *an*) = *šeim hubultatum*, due to a confusion with another syllabary. Cf. RA 14, 4, 8. In the third line EAH 198 has *gištum*, gift. Cf. Langdon RA 14, 4, 9. In the fourth line, *še-bal* is dialectic for *ki-bal*. Cf. RA, 14, 4 note 3. Note also EAH 198's reading *šu-bil-tum*. The seventh line is the beginning of K. 4315. One would expect *a-mu-un-na-ru*. Perhaps we should instead of *ġal* read *AŠ-rum*, giving to AŠ the value *ru*. For *a-ru* = *šarāqu* cf. Langdon, *Babyloniaca* II 96. In the eighth line the variant K. 4315 has *e-pu-uš*. The two last lines are in EAH 198 and not in EAH 197.

It appears then that we have in these Hoffmann tablets a sort of

index to the most important Babylonian grammatical series. The first tablet of the series *gar-ra* = *hubullum* now identified can be restored from Rm. 2428 + K 4315 + K 7678. For tablet III cf. Meissner MVAG 1913, II 10-30. For tablet IV, cf. Delitzsch AL<sup>3</sup> 86-90; Langdon, *Sumerian Grammatical Texts*, 24-29. For tablet V, cf. Meissner, *Assyriologische Forschungen*, 1916, 18-43. On that series, see also C. H. W. Johns, AJSL 34 59-66.

We note that the number of vertical wedges is sometimes larger than that of the signs they precede, thus showing how the tablet was written.

The reverse of EAH 198 has been broken off entirely; that of EAH 197 is in a very bad condition. The first line begins *a-na* <sup>iu</sup>*Bel*. Lines 10-13 read: . . . *ša* <sup>iu</sup>*Bêli-šu-tariš mar ša* <sup>iu</sup>*Bel-uballit-su mar E-NE-RU* (?) *id* (?) *-din-nam* . . . *urruk ûmê-šu kunnu zeri-šu kunnu piri'i-šu kunnu* . . . *-šu kunnu* . . . *abi-šu kun-nu išdi-šu kun-nu išid bit amel abi-šu* . . . *tu-ub libbi-šu tu-ub šêrê-šu* . . . "which Belišutariš, son of Beluballitšu, son of E-NE-RU(?) gave (?) . . . Lengthening of days, establishing of his seed, establishing of his offspring, establishing of his . . . establishing of the . . . of his father, establishing of his line (foundation), establishing of the line of the house of his ancestors . . . gladness of his heart, gladness of his body. . . ."

At the end of line 13 we read: *la tari* . . . *mursi-šu la e-* [ ] *-šu magar bel littâti* (?) *ki-iš-tu ilu-* [ ] . . . "that his . . . illness return not, that he . . . not, the favor of the lord of posterity (?), the gift of the god . . ."

These tablets seem therefore to commemorate the owner's escape from illness. In line 11 the traces favor *DAM-šu* his wife, so perhaps the inscription would refer to a wife's recovery after childbirth.



EAR 197 Obv.

5  
10  
15  
20  
25  
30  
35  
40  
45  
50  
55  
60  
65  
70  
75  
80  
85  
90  
95  
100  
105  
110  
115  
120  
125  
130  
135  
140  
145  
150  
155  
160  
165  
170  
175  
180  
185  
190  
195  
200  
205  
210  
215  
220  
225  
230  
235  
240  
245  
250  
255  
260  
265  
270  
275  
280  
285  
290  
295  
300  
305  
310  
315  
320  
325  
330  
335  
340  
345  
350  
355  
360  
365  
370  
375  
380  
385  
390  
395  
400  
405  
410  
415  
420  
425  
430  
435  
440  
445  
450  
455  
460  
465  
470  
475  
480  
485  
490  
495  
500  
505  
510  
515  
520  
525  
530  
535  
540  
545  
550  
555  
560  
565  
570  
575  
580  
585  
590  
595  
600  
605  
610  
615  
620  
625  
630  
635  
640  
645  
650  
655  
660  
665  
670  
675  
680  
685  
690  
695  
700  
705  
710  
715  
720  
725  
730  
735  
740  
745  
750  
755  
760  
765  
770  
775  
780  
785  
790  
795  
800  
805  
810  
815  
820  
825  
830  
835  
840  
845  
850  
855  
860  
865  
870  
875  
880  
885  
890  
895  
900  
905  
910  
915  
920  
925  
930  
935  
940  
945  
950  
955  
960  
965  
970  
975  
980  
985  
990  
995  
1000

EAR 198 + 200 Rev.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

## WAS IKHNATON A MONOTHEIST ?

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

A MONOTHEIST is one who believes that there is but one God, whose being and existence pervades and transcends all space and time. From time to time the question has been raised as to whether the ancient Egyptians, as a people, or any individual Egyptian, ever attained to the conception of monotheism. The consensus of experts to-day is that beyond the reign of Ikhnaton neither Egypt as a nation, nor any individual Egyptian, ever developed such an idea. To be sure, older students of Egyptology, and some few even now, assert that monotheism was the most ancient form of Egyptian theological thought. There are also those who see monotheism in almost every period of Egyptian history. Those students, who find monotheism in Egypt anywhere outside the theology of Ikhnaton, are confused in their terms. They mistake monotheism for henotheism or pantheism. With such Egyptologists this study is not concerned.

But while it is generally conceded that monotheism was unknown in Egypt from the earliest to the latest times, except during the reign of Ikhnaton, it is still an open question whether Ikhnaton was a monotheist or not. And the question concerns itself chiefly with Ikhnaton himself, for it has never been contended by any defender of the monotheism of Ikhnaton's reign alone that the Egyptians of his reign were converted to monotheism. The cult of Ikhnaton never got beyond the court, so far as we know, and even there it was practiced probably only because it was the king's religion. But there are those who claim a pure monotheism for Ikhnaton. The most noteworthy of them is J. H. Breasted.<sup>1</sup> The opposite point of view is defended by W. Max Müller<sup>2</sup> and others.

The chief arguments for the affirmative are: The destruction, in inscriptions, of the name of Amon and of other gods; the erasure

<sup>1</sup> Especially in *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, New York, 1912, pp. 6, 315, 347; and in other earlier works.

<sup>2</sup> Especially in *The Mythology of All Races: Egyptian*, Boston, 1918, pp. 224-231; and in other works.



of the word for "gods"; the absence of the word for "gods" in the inscriptions of the reign of Ikhnaton; the use of such phrases, in reference to Aton, as "O thou sole god, beside whom there is no other"; and the building of temples to Aton in Nubia and Syria. Those, who take the negative point of view, see nothing in these arguments that can prove anything beyond henotheism or pantheism. They understand by "henotheism" a belief in the being and existence of one god, not to the exclusion of a belief in the being and existence of other gods, but with no particular attention to them; and by "pantheism," a belief in the identification of god with the physical world or universe in which we live.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the general question of Egyptian monotheism, nor even to follow in detail all the arguments for and against the monotheism of Ikhnaton. But the purpose is to enquire whether Ikhnaton was a monotheist, and in so doing to discuss all the essential points, at present known, which lead towards a decision. A general knowledge of the details of history and religion in the Eighteenth Dynasty will be assumed.

Very shortly after the beginning of Ikhnaton's reign (as early as his sixth year), he began a campaign against other gods, which he prosecuted with ever renewed vigour till his death. His special effort was directed towards the head of the Theban triad, Amon. Wherever Amon's name occurred, in inscriptions, whether alone or in composition with other words to form names, it was hammered out. He changed his own name from Amenhotep to Ikhnaton, and caused the names of his courtiers to be changed.<sup>3</sup> Breasted thinks that his persecution included all the gods,<sup>4</sup> but others believe that his wrath was directed against Amon alone, while still others hold that his persecution was extended to Ptaḥ, Hathor, and all the cycle of Amon. In reality, there is no evidence that any gods outside the Theban triad were persecuted, although there is evidence that gods of the Amon cycle were opposed (see note 3). What has led some students to assert that only Amon was persecuted is the fact that at such places as the Speos Artemidos only the name of Amon is erased, but there is reason to believe that the other names were unintentionally overlooked. And, furthermore, such students often mis-

<sup>3</sup> Thus Rā-mose was changed from Ptaḥ-mose (MDOG, No. 55, 17).

<sup>4</sup> BAR II, § 937, note b.

take inscriptions of the first five years of Ikhnaton's reign for those of his sixth and following years. It happened that some of the earlier inscriptions escaped the notice of Ikhnaton's revising agents. For up till the sixth year of his reign Ptaḥ, as well as other gods and goddesses, were worshipped by him.<sup>5</sup> The net result is that Ikhnaton persecuted Amon and his circle but there is no evidence that the persecution extended beyond that. The erasure of the word "gods" cannot be taken to prove the contrary. It can, however, be taken to show that Amon was not the only god persecuted. But this is evident for a reason already stated.

The change of Ikhnaton's general's name from Ptaḥ-mose to Rā-mose would show that Ikhnaton was exceedingly friendly to the Heliopolis god Rā. But the god whom Ikhnaton adopted and whom he believed (according to some Egyptologists) to be the Only God, namely Aton, is identified with Rā. There seems to be no doubt that Ikhnaton did consider his god Aton to be identical with Rā, for the temple of Aton in Heliopolis was called "Exultation of Rā in On,"<sup>6</sup> and the queen-mother's temple at Tell el-Amarna was called "Shadow of Rā."<sup>7</sup> Moreover, we read, in one of Ikhnaton's inscriptions, "Mayest thou see Rā at noon when he rises on the eastern horizon, and mayest thou see Aton when he sets on the western horizon of heaven."<sup>8</sup> But just this kind of identification makes us wonder whether, after all, Ikhnaton did not differentiate between Aton and Rā; but only associated them as being gods of the same cycle or family, for according to an accepted form of Egyptian theology the sun at noon was Rā, but at dawn he was Khepera, at sunset he was Atum, and near the horizon he was Ḥarakhti. But the sun was Rā, *par excellence*, so we read of Rā-khepera, Rā-Atum, and Rā-Ḥarakhti. Now Aton was also Rā, but Rā in a specific aspect, namely, as *štw-t*, beams, indicating energy, *nfrw*, beauty, indicating light, and *mrwt*, love, indicating heat. In other words, Aton was Rā at the two horizons, namely, Rā-Ḥarakhti. But "Aton" was an old name for the physical sun, and probably designated his disk; hence Ikhnaton's symbol for Aton, namely, a

<sup>5</sup> F. L. Griffith, *Hieratic Papyri from Kahun and Gurob*, London, 1897-98, pl. XXXVIII, and pp. 91-92; RT 6, 54-56.

<sup>6</sup> Rt 16, 123. <sup>7</sup> BAR II, § 956.

<sup>8</sup> N. de G. Davies, *The Rock Tombs of El Amarna*, London, 1908, VI, p. 35.



disk with rays ending in hands, which hold the sign of life.<sup>9</sup> Aton was therefore Rā, and "the words of Rā" were the words of Aton,<sup>10</sup> but there was still a distinction, Aton being Rā at the horizons, and so Ikhnaton called his new capital, Akhetaton, "Horizon of Aton." So far we have seen, then, the god Aton was the sun at its rising and at its setting, when its energy, light, and heat were not too strong to be contemplated and worshipped. But he was, nevertheless, an aspect of the material sun personified, deified, and identified in part with Rā, the old Heliopolitan sun-god.

In spite of Breasted's explanation,<sup>11</sup> it seems clear that Ikhnaton, after his fifth year, retained a place for the Vulture goddess of the South and the Cobra goddess of the North. The reference to himself as "Horus" and the "Strong Bull" (the Mnevis Bull) only shows, however, that he still made use of old titles; but the phrase, "Favorite of the Two Goddesses" <sup>12</sup> shows that he still recognized the goddesses of the South and North. This in itself would seem to be sufficient to damage the evidence for monotheism. But that is not all. Ikhnaton looked upon himself as a god — divine in just the same way as other Egyptian pharaohs were divine. He was the "Son of Rā," <sup>13</sup> was identified with Horus and the Mnevis Bull,<sup>13</sup> was identified with Hapi, the Nile-god,<sup>14</sup> was the "beautiful child of Aton" in the same way as Amenhotep I was "the beautiful child of Amon," <sup>15</sup> and was called the "good god." <sup>16</sup> In salutations he and his queen were associated with Aton; he had priests of his own cult; he was more prominent in his character of "good god" than almost any other Egyptian king; and he was actually worshipped.<sup>17</sup> Thus, we see not only that there is no direct evidence that Ikhnaton persecuted other gods than the cycle of Amon, but also that he recognized at least three other deities, the Two Goddesses and himself. The chances are also that in his mind Rā was not completely identified with Aton and that perhaps Horus and the Mnevis Bull and even Hapi had independent existence. However that may be, Ikhnaton was a god, and that is enough to spoil the evidence of

<sup>9</sup> Cf. PT, § 334.

<sup>11</sup> BAR II, p. 395, note a.

<sup>13</sup> BAR II, § 959.

<sup>10</sup> BAR II, § 945.

<sup>12</sup> BAR II, § 959.

<sup>14</sup> Davies, *op. cit.* I pl. XXXVIII, l. 2; II pl. VII, l. 14; II, pl. XXI, 2, l. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Davies, *op. cit.* VI, pl. XX, and p. 13.

<sup>16</sup> BAR II, § 959.

<sup>17</sup> Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 13; F. Ll. Griffith, "Jubilee of Akhenaton," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, V, 63.

monotheism, in the late Hebrew or modern scientific sense of the term. According to the Egyptians' (including Ikhnaton) way of thinking, Ikhnaton was as much of a god as Thutmose III. There were, therefore, at least, two gods — however Horus, the Mnevis Bull, Hapi, the Two Goddesses, and Rā may be explained.

Another point, which the upholders of monotheism in the reign of Ikhnaton have emphasised, is associated with a phrase which occurs in one, or perhaps two, of the shorter Aton hymns; namely, *nn ky wpw hr-f*, "beside whom there is no other."<sup>18</sup> This is connected with a phrase in the great Aton hymn, which most likely can be restored to read, *pa ntr wā nn ky hrw-f*, "O thou sole god, beside whom there is no other,"<sup>19</sup> but which may also be translated "O thou sole god, to whom none other is rival."<sup>20</sup> But however this may be translated, considering Egyptian modes of expression, it cannot be taken as a proof of monotheism, for many gods were spoken of as "the one god." Thus Amon-Rā is "he who hath made all, the sole one."<sup>21</sup> Nor can the expression "beside whom there is no other" be confined to Aton worship. In the daily ritual of the divine cult, in the time of Seti I, the goddess Maāt is referred to thus: *wpw hr-k nn ky hmā-k*, "beside thee is no other with thee."<sup>22</sup> Such phrases are no more than extreme examples of henotheism. When an Egyptian said, "O thou sole god, beside whom there is no other," he evidently means that for his immediate needs, or, so far as he is at present concerned no other gods may be taken into consideration. The same and similar phrases may be found in considerable quantity at a time when there can be no question of real monotheism. The two quotations recorded above are sufficient for our purpose.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Davies, *op. cit.*, I, pl. XXXVI, l. 1; p. 49; probably also in III, pl. XXIX, l. 1, though the original is broken.

<sup>19</sup> Davies, *op. cit.* VI, pl. XXVII, l. 8; Cf. Breasted, *The Philosophy of a Memphite Priest*, Z Aeg. 1901, 53.

<sup>20</sup> Davies, *op. cit.* VI, p. 30 Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 228, "Thou only god, whose place none else can take!" is too free.

<sup>21</sup> E. A. W. Budge, *The Book of the Dead*, London, 1898, ch. XV.

<sup>22</sup> A. Moret, *Le Rituel du Culte divin journalier en Égypte*, Paris, 1902, 140.

<sup>23</sup> For other examples, see Hymns to Rā, "sole lord taking captive all lands every day"; Thoth, "thou art the one god that hath no equal"; Amon-Rā, "the one alone without peer"; Amon, "thou art the sole god, there is no other" (not necessarily borrowed from the Aton Hymn, as Breasted, *op. cit.*, p. 350, would have us believe); and in the Seventeenth Chapter of the Book of the Dead, Tem says, "I am the only one."



Besides these two chief arguments — the persecution of other gods, and the phrase, “ O thou sole god, beside whom there is no other ” — those who favour monotheism in Ikhnaton’s reign point to the many expressions of universal power and sway in the great Aton Hymn. But there is not an expression of universalism, omnipotence, or omnipresence in the poem which cannot be paralleled many times over from other Egyptian hymns. As Müller has well said concerning the contents of Ikhnaton’s poems, “ they present scarcely a religious thought which cannot be found in earlier literature. They might almost as well have been written of the solar deities of preceding generations.”<sup>24</sup> For example, of Aton we read: “ Thou makest the seasons in order to create all thy work; winter to bring them coolness, and heat that they may taste thee.” Of Rā also it is said: “ He maketh the seasons by the months, heat when he desires, cold when he desires.” Further, it will be interesting to note the following parallels:

“ Thou didst create men . . . all cattle large and small ” (Aton).

“ Creator of all and giver of their sustenance ” (Rā).

“ Maker of men, creator of beasts ” (Amon-Rā).

“ Maker of men and creator of animals ” (Amon).

“ When the fledgling in the egg chirps in the shell, thou givest him breath ” (Aton).

“ Giving breath to those in the egg ” (Amon-Rā).

“ O lord of eternity ” (Aton).

“ Lord of eternity ” (Amon-Rā).

“ Traversing eternity ” (Rā).

“ Thou didst make the distant sky to rise therein ” (Aton).

“ Maker of things below and above ” (Amon-Rā).

“ Thou didst establish the world ” (Aton).

“ Who raiseth the heavens, who fixeth the earth ” (Amon-Rā).

“ The world is in thy hand, even as thou hast made it ” (Aton).

“ O maker of everything that is ” (Amon-Rā).

“ Thou art in my heart ” (Aton).

“ Who hath set him (Amon) in his heart.”

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.* 231.

"The two lands are in daily festivity . . . their arms lifted up in adoration to thy dawning" (Aton).

"Every country adoreth thee, to the height of heaven, to the depths of the earth, to the depths of the Great Green Sea" (Amon-Rā).

Thus the universality, omnipotence, and omnipresence of Aton are the same as that of many other Egyptian gods, especially Rā, Amon-Rā, and Amon. It has its parallel in Babylonia, for example, in an address to Enlil by Nebuchadrezzar I.<sup>25</sup> They are the universality, omnipotence, and omnipresence of the material sun. No one who reads the Hymns of Ikhnaton with care can fail to see that the god which he is describing is the physical sun. There is not an epithet which is not perfectly applicable to the energy, light, and heat, that is, the beams, beauty, and love, of the sun. One needs only to read Isaiah 45 to see, by contrast, the universality, omnipotence, and omnipresence of a true monotheism. Moreover, the same hymns show, only too clearly, the limitations of Aton as a universal god, for when he sets in the western horizon of the sky, the earth is in darkness like the dead. He is thus limited both as to space and time. Nor can he comfort the dead, for they need what he cannot give. He seems to have nothing to do with the abode of the dead. It was undoubtedly this limitation which did more than anything else to render the religion of Ikhnaton so unattractive to the Egyptian people. And there is every reason to believe that Ikhnaton himself had little faith in Aton beyond the grave. At any rate, the numerous material offerings of food, drink, and flowers, depicted on his monuments,<sup>26</sup> show that he kept one eye steadily on the needs of the future. In fact, there is in all the inscriptions of Ikhnaton's reign no evidence that any change had been made in his eschatological ideas, which means that Osiris, though in the background, was not far away.

On a closer study the religion of Aton turns out to be nothing more than a solar henotheism, or a kind of solar universalism, such as we see in the reign of Amenhotep III. Atonism is not a new religion at all.<sup>27</sup> Even the symbol adopted by Ikhnaton, the disk with rays,

<sup>25</sup> W. J. Hinke, *A new Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I from Nippur*, Philadelphia, 1907, pp. 143 ff.

<sup>26</sup> For example, Davies, *op. cit.*, I, pl. XXII.

<sup>27</sup> In contrast to Davies, *op. cit.*, I, p. 46.

was already represented in the time of Amenhotep III,<sup>28</sup> the arms being referred to in a hymn to Amon-Rā ("who sendeth forth his arms as he wills"), and the hands, which hold the sign of life, in the same hymn ("thou one alone with many hands"). Most convincing of all in this matter, is the name of a regiment, found on a stela in the British Museum, "The god Aton shines upon Amenhotep III." There is no evidence that the essence of Ikhnaton's religion was different from what preceded or followed his time. It was an attempt to ostracise Amon and his cycle, and to concentrate upon Aton, by a king, who had strong personal likes and dislikes, who was undoubtedly a strong personality, with rare and original viewpoints. The change, which has led most students of Ikhnaton's religion astray, was that which took place in the conception of architecture, art, and a love of nature, with an attempt to represent things in a natural way.<sup>29</sup> In this Ikhnaton was a genuine reformer, and his reform naturally reacted upon his theological conceptions. But, the changes that can be observed in his religious ideas resulted from his antagonism and hatred of Amon, as well as from his strange personality, but they were connected closely with what preceded his time, and are to be characterized by their omissions rather than by their commissions. That is, Ikhnaton neglected the worship of other gods, he ignored the popular religion of Osiris, and did not observe the popular feast and festivals, but, with the exception of his persecution of the cycle of Amon, there is no evidence that he forbade his people to follow their old religious practices. In short, the reform of Ikhnaton was more political than religious. He was opposed to Amon and his priesthood, and desired to elevate Rā, and did so by reviving the idea of Rā-Harakhti, and breathing into it the freshness of his original and strange personality.

Even if it could be admitted that Ikhnaton developed a kind of practical or artistic monotheism, it certainly cannot be said that his monotheism was an ethical one, for there are practically no references to moral matters in his hymns, and the ethical conceptions of

<sup>28</sup> R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, III, 91g.

<sup>29</sup> Minor changes were made in details of writing, such as the enclosing of Aton's name in a cartouche, the frequent representation of flowers among objects of offerings, and the adoption of unusual formulae on scarabs; but at the same time many minor details of early religious ritual were retained, such as the use of the uræus and hawk, and the stereotyped royal titles.



Akhetaton are not to be compared with those of Heliopolis or of Thebes. Ikhnaton emphasised beneficence and beauty, but had practically nothing to say about righteousness and justice. Outside the hymns, the phrase "living in truth" does occur, but it, as much else, is merely an echo of earlier expressions, for "the great god who lives by truth" is Amon-Rā. Ikhnaton's own personal faith in Aton was very great, but we look in vain for moral expressions, such as the following, which were daily on the lips of the worshippers of Amon-Rā and Amon:

"Listening to the poor who is in distress;  
Gentle of heart when one cries unto him.  
Deliverer of the timid from the violent;  
Judging the poor, the poor and the oppressed.  
Lord of mercy most loving." (Amon-Rā).

"He delivereth the helpless one (Amon).

He speaketh the gentle word at the movement of strife." (Amon).

Abundant material for comparison may also be found in the hymns to Osiris.

Was Ikhnaton a monotheist? The answer depends to some extent upon the will to believe. If a man makes up his mind that he wants to believe that Ikhnaton was a monotheist "all the king's horses and all the king's men" will fail to have any influence. But a careful consideration of what has been presented in this paper will, it is believed, make one think again before he claims monotheism for Ikhnaton. In view of the apparent intention of Ikhnaton to persecute, in a political way primarily, the god Amon and his cycle; of the fact that Ikhnaton considered himself, as well as Aton, a god; of the use of the phrase "sole god, beside whom there is no other" in reference to other deities; of the use of the same terms of universalism, omnipotence, and omniscience when thinking of other deities; of the fact that Aton has no place in the future, when preparations were still being made for that estate; of the failure to disconnect Atonism from the same limitations of the worship of Amon-Rā, and Amon; and of the inferior moral character of Ikhnaton's religion, it must be concluded, in spite of the absence of the word for "gods" in Aton inscriptions, and the presence of Aton temples in Nubia and Syria, both of which phenomena are easily explained

politically, that the modern term monotheist can hardly be applied to Ikhnaton. Ikhnaton did not believe that there is but one god, nor did he believe that Aton's being and existence pervaded and transcended all space and time; for Ikhnaton himself was a god, and Aton was absent during darkness, and found no place in his providence for the grave. Aton was the personification of the material sun, or the force by which the sun acted, and was one and universal merely in a solar sense. Nor was Ikhnaton a pantheist, for he did not identify Aton with the physical world or universe in which we live. But he was a henotheist, because he believed in the being and existence of one god, not to the exclusion of a belief in the being and existence of other gods, but with no particular attention to them.

There is no denying the fact that Ikhnaton was a great personality. He dominated the situation, he could see it and control it. He broke with the priests of Amon because of their great power. He banished their god, and set up another in his place. He established a new capital, and installed his religion. He had the strength of personality to shake off, to a great extent, though not completely, the shackles of the past. He instituted new customs and new fashions, new art and new architecture. He could see nature as she is, and insisted upon having her depicted as such. He often clothed old theological thought in new garments, and, being a lover and student of nature, he was a poet. As poetry his hymns are never surpassed and rarely equalled in Egyptian literature. But all that and much more do not necessarily make Ikhnaton a monotheist. Without detracting from his personality and the fascination of his freshness, in the midst of so much Egyptian conservatism, the name of monotheist, and especially ethical monotheist, must be denied him.

Like most great personalities, Ikhnaton was an individualist, which accounts for much of his trouble with the priests of Amon, for his fierce persecution of their god, and for his inconsistent use of such old phrases as "sole god, beside whom there is no other." As an individualist, he even went so far as to claim an exclusive right to a knowledge of Aton, "there is no other knoweth thee save thy son Ikhnaton." It was this extreme individualism and egotism which not only explains his inability to tolerate anyone who does

not agree with him, and to set a court fashion and etiquette which he enforced upon every one who came into contract with him, but also furnishes the key to the whole religious situation of his reign. Aton was his personal god. He was Aton's son and equal. Aton and he were the church and state, all rolled into one. The recognition of other gods, especially of those of the late capital, would only interfere with their supremacy. His antagonism to them was not because he did not believe in their being and existence — for if so, why persecute them? — but because they were a disturbing element in his vision of a personal god as the state god, and himself as his companion and equal. Ikhнатon was not a monotheist, but he was a clever and self-centered individual henotheist.



## CONTRIBUTION TO ASSYRIAN LEXICOGRAPHY

By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

### 6. *tarābu*, be covered with dust, be begrimed, dark.

THIS root is omitted in DELITZSCH's *Handwörterbuch* but is entered by MUSS-ARNOLT in *Assyrian Dictionary*, p. 1190 without definition. Assyrian syllabaries, however, admit no doubt concerning the general meaning, and the Arabic cognate *taraba*, to be covered with dust, ensures the specific implication of this verb. Note the following passages:

*GIG-GIG* (*kukki*) = *ta-ra-[bu]* with *da'āmu*, be dark, V R. 23a 18.  
*dara* = *da'āmu*, *tarābu*, CT. 26, 43 VIII 3.

[*GIG-GIG*] = *turrubu* to trouble, make sad, Sm. 896, 2 = CT 19, 35.

*še-ir*<sup>1</sup> = *ta-[ra-bu]* with *enēšu*, be miserable, K. 4258, 5 and 7.

*še-ir* = *tur-ru-[bu]* with *unnu[šu]*, K. 4258, 10 and 11.

With these grammatical passages the omen text, CT. 28, 29, 4 should be compared.

*šumma paṇi-šu tur-ru-ub*, if his face be begrimed.

This passage follows one which contains the verbal forms *du-um* = *du''um*, be darkened, and *ukkul*, same sense. The well known noun *turbu*, *turbu'u*, *turbu'tu*, dust, Arabic *tarbā'* earth, dust, is naturally connected with the same root.

### 7. *kallatu*, bride, "she that is confined in a house."

The Semitic *kallatu* has been long since correctly connected with the verb *kalû* to confine, imprison, and is undoubtedly connected with a custom still extant in Jewish marriage ceremonies. The man and woman probably stood under a canopy the name of which in Rabbinic Hebrew is *huppâ* and after the marriage the bride and bridegroom remained in this closed tent for several days. The

<sup>1</sup> For the root *šer* be troubled, sad, see *Sumerian Grammar*, p. 240. Verbs of the meaning "dark, gloomy, etc." invariably develop this secondary sense.

custom has survived in the modern Jewish marriage ritual where the bride and bridegroom stand under a canopy held over them by four attendants. Although this marriage ritual may be specifically a Semitic custom nevertheless the Sumerians must have had much the same feeling in regard to the privacy of a bride for their expression is *é-gi-a* = *é-gig* < *é-gi-gi*, she that is confined in a house. For the root *gi* = *lamû*, confine, see K. 12026, 19 = CT. 19, 26 and especially note the following passages:

*me-gal-gal-bi é-ám gi* = *parşê-šu rabûti ina bili pihû*,  
 "Its great ordinances are withheld in the temple."<sup>1</sup>

Naturally the Babylonian custom may have been derived from the Sumerian. The term *é-gi-a* certainly does not refer to a temporary canopy, but it does indicate a custom of confining a bride to her husband's house immediately after the marriage. A young Assyriologist,<sup>2</sup> now resident in Oxford, believes that the Jewish custom is reflected in the Code of Hammurabi, § 176, *ištu innemdu*, "After they were united," literally "they stood together." The language of the code clearly refers to the period of confinement immediately after the marriage.

The custom is also Sumerian. In PROFESSOR A. T. CLAY'S *Miscellaneous Inscriptions*, No. 28, Col. V, the verb *é-gi* occurs twice in the sense of "leading home a bride," in this case illegally and by force and the law really amounts to a case of rape. I find great difficulty in the interpretation of the two Sumerian laws which follow and my rendering is hesitatingly offered as an alternative to that given by the first editor.

40. <i>tukundibi</i>	40. If (a man)
41. <i>dumu-sal galu e-sir-ra</i>	41. the daughter of a freeman from the street
42. <i>é-im-gi</i>	42. took home to confinement
43. <i>ad-da-ni</i>	43. (and) her father
44. <i>ù ama-ni</i>	44. and her mother
45. <i>nu-ba-<sup>3</sup>an-zu-uš</i>	45. knew not of it

<sup>1</sup> RADAU, *Babylonian Expedition*, Vol. 30, No. 12, 19. Variants in REISNER, *Sum.-Bab. Hymnen* 60, Rev. 12 and PSBA. 1895, 64, Plate I, Col. I 12 *é-a é-ám-gi*.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. M. SIDERSKI, B. A. (Cambridge).

<sup>3</sup> Text clearly *zu*.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 46. <i>ka-ar-ak-ā</i>  | 46. if "I seized her" <sup>3</sup>            |
| 47. <i>nam-ad-ni</i> <sup>1</sup> <i>ù ama-ni</i> <sup>1</sup> | 47. to her father and her mother              |
| 48. <i>ni-dug-e</i> <sup>2</sup>                               | 48. he says                                   |
| 49. <i>ad-da-ni</i>  | 49. her father                                |
| 50. <i>ù ama-ni</i>  | 50. and her mother                            |
| 51. <i>nam-dam-ni-šū</i>                                       | 51. unto wifehood                             |
| 52. <i>in-na-sum-mu</i>  | 52. shall give her to him.                    |
| 53. <i>tukundibi</i>   | 53. If (a man)                                |
| 54. <i>dumu-sal galu e-sir-ra</i> <sup>4</sup>                 | 54. the daughter of a freeman from the street |
| 55. <i>é-im-gi</i>   | 55. took home to confinement                  |
| 56. <i>ad-da-ni</i>  | 56. and her father                            |
| 57. <i>ù ama-ni</i>  | 57. and her mother                            |
| 58. <i>ba-an-zu-uš</i>   | 58. knew of it                                |
| 59. <i>lù é-im-gi</i>  | 59. he who took her home to confinement       |
| 60. <i>in-dib in-tar</i>                                       | 60. shall be seized and examined              |
| 61. <i>e dingir-ra</i> ?                                       | 61. In the temple of god . . .                |
| 62. <i>in-</i> ?   | 62. he shall . . .                            |

8. *ana la hâzim rîga*, Code of Hammurabi, Epilogue, 198-199 <sup>5</sup>

My present note discusses a hitherto untranslated passage of the epilogue of the Code of Hammurabi. In all the numerous editions of this famous text the passage in question has been abandoned as unintelligible. The entire passage I would read and interpret as follows:

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 194. <i>a-wa-tu-û-a na-aš-ga</i> | 194. My words are choice.                    |
| 195. <i>ip-še-tu-û-a</i>         | 195. My deeds                                |
| 196. <i>ša-ni-nam</i>            | 196. a rival                                 |
| 197. <i>u-ul i-ša-a</i>          | 197. have not.                               |
| 198. <i>e-la a-na la ha-</i>     | 198. They are eminent and                    |
| 199. <i>-zi-im ri-ga</i>         | 199. are so comprehensible that none escape. |

<sup>1</sup> The sign is rendered *ni* only by the context. The second form suggests *UD* or *SAB*.

<sup>2</sup> This verb represents *iktibi* so common in the Code.

<sup>3</sup> *ka-ar*. The meaning of the law depends upon this obscure phrase. The word *ka-ar-ab-ā* seems to be a compound verb. *kar-ā* = *kar-ē* ?

<sup>4</sup> The sign seems to be *da*.

<sup>5</sup> Ordinarily indicated by Col. XXV, rev. 103-104.



Previous editors of these lines divided the syllables into *e-la-a na-ha-la ri-im-ri-ga* and UNGNAD even enters the words *nahaku* and *zimgu* in the vocabulary of his edition. Words are often divided between lines on the Stele of Hammurabi and the infinitive *hāzu* = *hāšu* is not an exception. The verb חזו, to flee, escape, occurs in my *Neu-Babylonische-Königsinschriften* 174, 25, *i-hu-ša* where the synonym *ipparšā* admits no doubt concerning the meaning of *hāšu*. As to *rīga*, the form is simply the permansive feminine plural of רחק, *rahāku* > *rēku*, be far away, extend afar. The lexicons state that the permansive *Qal* is *rūku* but the form is really the permansive *Piel* or more likely the adjective *rūku* inflected as a verb. For the true permansive *Qal* of *rēku* see ZIMMERN *Kultlieder* 214, I, 10, *alakta-ša ri-ki-it*, "Her way extends afar."

9. *gabraḥ*, Code of Hammurabi, Epilogue 260.

The epilogue of the Code of Hammurabi contains another unexplained passage. The transcription and translation are as follows:

259. <i>te-ši la šu-ub-bi-im</i>	259. Misery not to be overcome
260. <i>ga-ba-ra-aḥ</i>	260. terror at
261. <i>ha-la-ki-šu</i>	261. his ruin
262. <i>i-na šu-ub-ti-šu</i>	262. in his dwelling place
263. <i>li-ša-ap-pi-ha-aš-šum</i>	263. may he cause to arise against him.

The word *gabarāḥ* is undoubtedly identical with *gabraḥhu* of the Assyrian omen texts where it occurs repeatedly as a synonym of *ešū*, misery. In fact the orthography of the Code indicates that we must correct an error of long standing in Assyriology. The omen texts have the ideogram *GAB-LAH* and the loan-word *GAB-LAH-hu* which has been rendered *gablahhu*.<sup>1</sup> But the sign *LAH LUH* (BRÜNNOW, *Classified List*, 6159) has also the values *riḥ* and *rah*; *raḡ* is probably the original value of this sign and means *rahāšu*, wash away, and *misū*, to wash. For the Semitic value *rah*

<sup>1</sup> So for example FOSSEY in his *Strie Summa ŠA-TAB*, p. 43; BOISSIER, *Choix de Textes*, 223; JASTROW, *AJSL*. 1907, 113 ff., who rendered *GAB-LAH* by *sakmaštu* overlooking the loan-word *gablahhu*. Also BOISSIER, l. c., who rendered the ideogram by *gilittu*, took no account of the loan-word. BOISSIER's rendering "crainte" was, however, approximately correct.

note BA. V 648, 1, *šit-rah*, the mighty, and ZIMMERN, *Ritualtafeln*, p. 166, note 2. The loan-word occurs in Sm. 674, 18 (BEZOLD, *Catalogue*, Vol. IV); *ešû u gab-rah-hu*, misery and terror. *gab-rah-hu*, CT. 20, 30 Obv. 11, cited by VIROLLEAUD, *Babyloniaca*, III 169. The ideogram is frequent; *gab-rah ummāni-ia*, or *ummān nakri*, BOISSIER, *Documents Assyriens*, 226, 16; 220, 2-3; CT. 20, 31, 35-36. According to the commentary on liver omen texts, CT. 20, 42, 32, *gab-rah-hu* is also the name of a weapon and is described as *isû kakki eši*, weapon of misery, and it is there said to be a symbol of the god Ea.

The Sumerian word *gabraĝ* means "to smite the breast," to terrorize. *raĝ* is a well known verb for smite, beat, and occurs ordinarily in the abbreviated form *ra*. Note especially the Sumerian verb, *gab-e ba-da-ab-ra-aš*, "They smote them on the breast," they terrorized them.<sup>1</sup> The word obviously means terror, fear, and the loan-word *ga-ab-ra-ah-hu* in the Assyrian calendar, V Raw. 48 IV 28 and V 28<sup>2</sup> indicates clearly enough the Sumerian pronunciation *gabraĝ*.

<sup>1</sup> *Babyloniaca*, VI 107, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cited by UNGNAD, *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, p. 128.

## REVIEWS

*Le Poème sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge et de la Chute de l'homme.*  
Par S. Langdon. Traduit par Chas. Virolleaud. Ernest Leroux,  
Paris, 1919. Pp. 268, pls. ix.

In 1912 Professor Langdon copied a triangular fragment of a tablet in the Nippur collection in Philadelphia. In 1915, after restoring the tablet, he published the results of his investigations upon this important document, in his *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, The Flood, and the Fall of Man*, where he gave a full transliteration and translation of the tablet with detailed discussions. This publication called forth a great deal of criticism, especially from Jastrow, Barton, and Witzel. The author, recognizing that this edition of his work was not free from error, especially as it was in part done on the basis of a photograph of the original, waited till he could get at the original again, and now has issued a new work on the tablet in which necessary improvements have been made and mistakes rectified. It is, however, gratifying to find that, in spite of the acknowledged difficulty of making a first translation of an unilingual text, Dr. Langdon's general results are the same as those of 1915. They have, furthermore, been confirmed by the discovery of a new Sumerian poem relative to the same subject. This new poem is published in this new work. It is transliterated and translated, with a facsimile of its text on plates VII and VIII. In it the name Tagtug is found as an equivalent of Utanapištim. In addition to all this, use has been made of Scheil's two new syllabaries, which reveal the primitive sense of the name Tagtug, and its identification with Zi-ud-suddu, who is the hero of the deluge in a Sumerian poem of the same epoch as Langdon's poem.

In this French edition of his work, Landgon has corrected two grave errors which are found in the English edition. The first has to do with Isimu, the messenger of Enki to Innini; and the second relates to the reading of *bi* for *teg*, and to the confusion of the eighth plant, the cassia, with the interdicted plant which is not named. After these and some minor errors have been corrected, it is plainly



seen that Langdon's critics very greatly overreached themselves. It is a comparatively easy task to criticize a pioneer translation of an unilingual Sumerian text, but to furnish a new and consistent substitute is a different matter. This latter his critics have failed to do.

The bulk of this new edition is a literal translation of the English into French. But, in addition to much new discussion and many new notes, Dr. Langdon has here presented a corrected facsimile (pls. VII and VIII) and an improved transliteration and translation of text No. 8 of Barton's *Miscellaneous Babylonian Inscriptions*, in which Tagtug plays the part of Utanapištim; he has presented a transliteration and translation of text No. 25 of Poebel's *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, a long and interesting poem in which Isimu appears as the messenger of Enki; and he has written a new discussion of Marduk's association with Aruru, and a new note on Šuršanāpi and Puzur-Enlil. Yet Dr. Langdon would be the last to hold that his present study is the final word on the subject. His work is pioneering. Others will correct and supplement from time to time. In his discussion of the name Tagtug, where he makes such telling use of Scheil's syllabaries, Langdon is not always clear in his contentions, for it is not easy to understand how Uttu, the Sumerian name for Tagtug, means both "rest" and "press." He easily shows the philological equivalence of Utanapištim with Zi-ud-suddu, but his attempt at a philological connection between Tagtug and Noah is not as fortunate, in spite of the great probability of his contention that Uttu is an abbreviation of Utanapištim. Again, in his note on the so-called "Emperor-worship" of Babylonia, he lays great emphasis upon it as a phenomenon which resulted from the loss of paradise. This is not at all a necessary deduction, otherwise Egyptian Emperor-worship would be largely inexplicable. In minor philological matters many questions might be asked, for example, is not *ki*, p. 158, l. 2, a determinative of Dilmun; do lines 10-12, p. 161, faithfully render the original; is not the rendering Nintur for Nintud quite possible, if not probable (p. 170, l. 21); should not more have been said about the most crucial line in the whole text, namely, l. 32, p. 172, especially upon the word *ba-ni-in-rig*, which may be read *mi-ni-in-dug*, and change, to a large extent, the meaning of the poem; is it so certain that 𐎶𐎵𐎶, p. 13, does mean

"branch"; and is the question of *אֵת יְהוָה*, p. 75, finally settled? On all these questions fuller notes should have been written, and less should have been taken for granted. Some errors in the plates of the English edition have been corrected in this edition, such as the insertion of *igi* in I 22, and the recovery of the lost line, 46, of plate VI. This latter has resulted in the misnumbering of lines 40 and 41 on the same plate of the French edition.

To students of Oriental religions, one of the most useful parts of Dr. Langdon's book is his discussion of the theology of the Eridu and Nippur schools. According to the former, Enki created the universe and man as well; but according to the latter the earth-god Enlil created the universe, and he assisted the mother-goddess Nintud (or Aruru) in creating man out of clay. Assyrian theologians followed the teaching of Eridu; and the same teaching is to be found in the oldest Hebrew account, though a mixture is evident, as in the Babylonian tradition. There is much more important theological material, such as the question of the origin of sin, which had been already discussed in the English edition. This fine work is characteristic of Dr. Langdon's productions, and is packed with the results of original research.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

*The Apocalypse of Abraham and The Ascension of Isaiah.* By C. H. Box, M.A., and R. H. Charles, D.D., and *The Apocalypse of Baruch and The Assumption of Moses.* By R. H. Charles, D.D. and William John Ferrar, M.A. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918.

In the publication of the above two volumes in the handy and convenient as well as cheap and serviceable series, the S.P.C.K. have again made the whole body of students, interested in things Jewish and early Christian, their debtors. For workmanship and general style the books are up to the average of this series. With the names of Charles, Box, and Oesterley attached we hardly need to recommend the volumes to those acquainted even in a limited way with the literature of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

The first volume, numbers 10 and 7, the *Apocalypse of Abraham and The Ascension of Isaiah*, contains 99 plus 62 pages, including introduction.

*The Apocalypse of Abraham* is "made accessible here to English readers for the first time . . . the explanatory notes, in this case, given in the commentary on the text, are rather larger and fuller than usual," for "the difficulties and obscurities in the text are not inconsiderable."

An introduction, pp. i-xxxiv, includes: (1) A Short Account of the Book; (2) The Slavonic Texts and MSS.; (3) Date of Composition and Original Language of the Book; (4) Early Attestation of the Book; (5) Gnostic Elements in the Text; (6) General Character of the Book and Integrity of its Text; (7) Theology of the Book; (8) Literary Affinities and Special Importance of the Book; and (9) Bibliography.

*The Ascension of Isaiah*, No. 7 in the series by R. H. Charles, D.D. The introduction by G. H. Box, is composed of pp. i-xxvi, including (1) A Short Account of the Book; (2) Titles of the Book; (3) The Ancient Versions; (4) Special Importance of the Book; (5) Bibliography.

Let us note the doctrines of importance in the *Ascension of Isaiah*, with which our little text deals admirably, and a perusal of which would well justify the purchase of the book: Demonology, Messiah, Seven Heavens, the Virgin Birth of Christ (xi: 2-20), probably an interpolation according to Dillman and Schürer, and the Trinity, which is a characteristically Jewish Trinity doctrine.

For the influence of the book on the origin and elaboration of Christian doctrines it is interesting and well worth reading, particularly now when a saner historical study is tracing ideas to their origin and following their development in the various forms which it took.

*The Apocalypse of Baruch* (No. 9, First Series), by the Rev. Canon R. H. Charles, and introduction by W. O. E. Oesterley. The introduction contains: (1) Titles and Relation to the Book of Baruch; (2) Authorship; (3) Date; (4) Language; (5) Contents; (6) Importance of the Book for the Study of Christian Origins; (7) Jewish and Christian Teaching. Here Dr. Oesterley in his incisive and vigorous manner, discusses the things vital in the book.

Importance of the Book for the Study of Christian Origins. Dr Oesterley has in this section a splendid note on Judaism and Christianity, and tells us how they differ in proportion rather than in the



substance of their doctrines (Introd., xvii-xix). He teaches that Christianity is a fulfilment of Judaism "in the sense that it widens develops, and spiritualizes what had been taught. . . . Christianity is the logical development of Judaism. . . . It is here that the importance of the Apocalypse of Baruch for the study of Christian origins comes in, for we have represented in it the Judaism which existed in the time of Christ and of the Apostles; by the study of this book we are able, in a number of ways, to see behind the teaching of the New Testament, and to understand the point and significance of much which without some knowledge of Judaism would not be possible.

*The Assumption of Moses.* The writer of the introduction, William John Ferrar, M.A., discusses this work in (1) The Composition of the Book; (2) History of Transmission; (3) Date and Nature of Book; (4) The Writer; (5) The "Assumption" and the New Testament.

These little books are printed on good paper, conveniently bound in a very practical format, and the text work leaves nothing to be desired. Typographical errors are few. Two classes of students interested in Jewish religion will buy these texts: those who cannot afford the larger works by Charles and Kautzsch, and those who want in addition to those bulky and necessary works, usable and practical small texts for convenience. In addition, some of these works appear in this series for the first time in English, and are not to be had in the larger works. On the whole we wish to commend the S.P.C.K. for their splendid work in this series.

D. ROY MATHEWS.

*The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament.* By Albert C. Knudson. New York and Cincinnati: Abingdon Press, 1918 pp. 416, \$2.50 net.

This book by the Professor of Old Testament in the Boston University School of Theology, is Christian through and through and does not leave the impression of so many books that the author is concerned with the historical science apart from its influence on Bible, Church, and Religion.

The point of view is historical and critical, but careful and conservative in the sense that such men as Driver are conservative.

In fact the conclusions to which the writer comes are often too careful and conservative, approaching somewhat arbitrariness. Too much is granted to Moses and the early religion of Israel, and monotheism is arrived at too early for the position of the author to be safely tenable, but this is pardonable as a reaction against the tendency to arrive very late at doctrines worth while in Israel, and then to derive them from foreign sources.

On the whole Professor Knudson is fair to the ritual side of religion, and rather kindly tolerates it on p. 151 and elsewhere, but on p. 160 says, "In the early days no mummary of ritual vitiated her worship." This, however, can be passed lightly, since he is here dealing with a difficult problem: the attitude of the prophets to ritual; yet those who are strictly fair will not be able to follow these conclusions (p. 160).

The chapter on *Atonement* is an excellent piece of work, but no reference is made to sacrifice and atonement in Babylonian ritual, where material is so plentiful. Another edition of the book ought at least to mention this.

Chapter VII, *Righteousness of God*, is, on the whole, the best part of the work. Here the author is excellent and the work very pleasing.

In the discussion of Amos, Dr. Knudson, considers Assyria the agent of coming doom for Israel, but the Urartu were active at this time, and Amos merely says "beyond Damascus." J. M. P. Smith, *Amos, Hosea, and Micah*, in the *Bible for Home and School* series, has a good note on this.

The author in discussing the Second Isaiah identifies the Servant with the Messiah rather arbitrarily. Again we cannot follow him where he pleads for the retaining of practically all passages of hope, considered generally interpolations, in the preëxilic prophets (p. 367 ff.).

This work is written from the topical rather than chronological point of view, although within the topical arrangement chronological discussion is maintained. It is, therefore, a fine work to use along with such books as Smith, Barton, and Peters on the Religion of Israel. It comes more nearly to being an Old Testament Theology than anything in English since the translations of the works by Piepenbring and Schultz.

Typographical and grammatical errors are few, and are confined

almost totally to the latter half of the book. Note *fit* for *fits* (p. 337); *R. N.* for *R. H.* Charles (p. 331); *Hanna* for *Hannah* or vice versa (pp. 337 and 339); *shall* for *shalt* (p. 402).

It is one of the best pieces of work in the field and is indispensable.

D. ROY MATHEWS.

*Les Juifs dans L'Empire Romain, Leur Condition Juridique Économique, et Sociale:* par Jean Juster, Docteur en Droit, avocat a la cour d'appel de Paris. Paris: Libraire Paul Geuthner, 1914.

This magnificent work by the brilliant French lawyer came out just prior to the outbreak of the war in 1914, which called attention so prominently to the French in military affairs, but works such as this show the value of the French in science and literature as well as in war.

Dr. Juster splendidly supplements Schürer, and writes from the point of view of a lawyer and not a theologian. For this reason his work is a valuable contribution to the study of the status of the Jews in the Roman Empire and their relation to the early beginnings of Christianity.

Juster is characterized by a larger fairness than men like Schürer, Weber, and Bousset, and in that matter rather belongs with Montefiore and Herford. One who would know the Jews in the Roman Empire cannot be without this work.

It is divided into two tomes: T. Premier, xviii plus 510 pages, and T. Second, viii plus 338 pages. The Table analytique des Matiers of the first volume has four chapter and Addenda, discussing: *Privilèges*; *Le Culte Juif*; *Organization Centrale des Juifs de L'Empire Roman*; and *Organization Locale*. The second volume has a like comprehensive table, comprising chapters V-XXII: *Status Civitatis*; *Status Personnel*; *Le Mariage*; *Le Divorce*; *Capacité de Fait*; *Contrats*; *Du Droit de Propriété*; *Esclaves*; *Testament et Succession*; *Juridiction*; *Costume*; *Nom*; *Tribus*; *Participation aux Distributions Gratuites*; *Spectacles*; *Droit de Vote*; *Charges Publiques* *Situation Économique*; *Addenda*.

A splendid feature of the work is the excellent bibliography, of which there is a separate one, in addition to the fact that the work is almost exclusively a detailed discussion in an intelligent and lively manner of works bearing on the subject. Dr. Juster has here gath-



ered all the literature on the subject, or cited works in which it can be found.

The comprehensive notes, hardly to be called *foot notes*, since they take up a great deal more space than the text proper and frequently occupy the whole page, are a welcome feature. One cannot help admiring the immense erudition of the author of such volumes.

There are many typographical errors, due, perhaps to the small type, although, on the whole, the work is remarkably free from striking errors. When English authorities are quoted the English capitalization of titles of books is disregarded the author following the French method here.

Many references are made to the *Patrologia Graecarum* and the *Patrologia Latinarum*, and the Greek type, while small, is still clear, and the same may be said of the Hebrew type.

The lawyer's point of view is greatly to the advantage of the author. Theologians are likely to have a professional bias. We are willing, also to grant a professional bias in the case of a lawyer, but here the bias is not noticeable and the lawyer point of view works splendidly to make this French work a complement of the first rank to Schürer. The scholar needs and must have both these works, but the possession of Schürer will not obviate the necessity of consulting Juster.

The price is high. It is impossible to secure the two tomes, only in brochure, for much less than \$10.00. but it is a mine of information, not to be had otherwise, and we welcome it as a contribution in our field, for this book seems to usher in a new day when the writing of books will be giving the evidence rather than deciding the issue.

D. ROY MATHEWS.

*Devil Worship.* By Isya Joseph. Richard G. Badger, Boston, 1919. Pp. 222. \$2.50 net.

In this volume Dr. Joseph has translated a manuscript, which contains the Sacred Books of the Yezidis, or Devil Worshipers, as well as a brief Introduction and an Appendix. The Sacred Books comprise the Book of Revelation (*Kitâb al-Jilwâh*) and the Black Book (*Maşhaf Rêş*). He has discussed the Sacred Books with much detail and learning and amassed the traditions and beliefs of this interesting people.

The Yezidis are a small and obscure religious sect, numbering about 200,000, and living in a belt of territory about three hundred miles wide, extending from Aleppo in Syria to the Caucasus in Russia. But what the religious origin of the Yezidis was has always been a great problem. Western orientalists have been divided into three schools of opinion on the question: those who hold that the sect takes its rise from Yezid bn Mu'âwiya; those who maintain that it is of Persian origin; and those who hold that it was founded by Šeih 'Adi. Dr. Joseph believes the Yezidis to have received their name from Yezid bn Unaisa, their founder, as a Harijite sub-sect in the early period of Islam; that at an early period in their development they were attracted by Šeih 'Adi's reputation as a great and good man, joined his followers, and took him for their chief religious teacher. To them many Christians, Persians, and Moslems joined themselves, together with a considerable number of pagans.

The Yezidis' idea of a personal God is purely transcendental and static. He manifests himself in three different forms; in the form of a bird, Melek Tâ'ûs, that is, King Peacock; in the form of an old man, Šeih 'Adi, who corresponds in places to the Holy Spirit in Christianity; and in the form of a young man, Yesîd, an ancestral father, to whom they trace their descent. Why the Yezidis worship the devil has been usually explained by supposing that the devil is so bad as to require constant propitiation, while God is so good as to forgive perforce. But Joseph thinks the more probable explanation is that the sect does not believe in an evil spirit but in Tâ'ûs as a true divinity, for there is nothing in the Sacred Books to indicate that he is an evil spirit or a fallen angel.

The author also translates an interesting Yezidis document in which these people claimed, in 1872, exemption from the Turkish draft. The document contains a list of religious and moral obligations which they claimed prevented them from becoming soldiers.

Joseph's book is of the highest value for students of comparative religions. He has been specializing in this particular field for many years, and some years ago published his Harvard Ph.D. thesis on the Yezidis in the *AJSL* 25. There are however, many disappointing things about this piece of work. The English is wretched, compare such expressions as, "that that is dedicated," p. 36; the spell-

ing is atrocious, for example, "dweling," "Stutgart," "Receu" for "Revue," "Archie" for "Archiv," "al-Amarna" for "el-Amarna," "Cholsohn" for "Chwolson"; and consistency in transliteration is almost unknown, for example, Harijite and Kharijite, Yezid and Yezid, etc. The author's bibliography leaves much to be desired. Some of the most interesting treatments of Yezidis problems are not once referred to; such as, for example; Bittner, *Die heiligen Bücher der Ieziden*, Wien, 1913; Heard, "Yezidis" (*Jour. of Royal Anthropol. Inst.*, Vol. 41); Marie, "La découverte récente des deux livres sacrés des Yezidis" (*Anthropos*, 1911), in which the script is deciphered. Dr. Joseph seems to have neglected his modern rivals, which makes one question the originality of his work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

*Letters and contracts from Erech written in the Neo-Babylonian period.* By Clarence E. Keiser. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917, p. 45 + 60 plates.

This volume contains 177 texts belonging to the private collection of the Rev. Dr. James B. Nies. Dr. Keiser gives complete indices of names of persons, scribes, deities, temples, places, canals and gates. The texts are dated from the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses.

Several of these texts are of value for the study of Babylonian religion. Text 67 is a letter referring to wine for the offerings (*gini-e*) of Shamash. In Nos. 18, 34, 62, 93, references are made to the Oriental practice of covenanting with salt. Text 167 is similar to other records of Erech, dealing with sheep set apart for slaughter, published by Dr. Clay in his *Miscellaneous Inscriptions*, I, 1915. Cf. p. 75 ff. Clay's texts were dated between the fifth year of Cyrus and the sixth of Cambyses. Keiser's text is also from the time of Cyrus. Among the texts published by Clay, nine tablets recorded a special offering on the 1st, 14th, 21st, and 28th; fourteen others did not record this quasi-hebdomadary sacrifice. On one of these fourteen, the special offering was made on days 6, 14, 21, 28; on two, on days 6, 14, 21, 27; on three, on days 6, 13, 20, 27; on one 6, 13, 20, 26; on one 6, 13, 21; on one 6, 21, 27; on one 7, 14, 21, 27; on one 6, 13; on one 7, 13; one one not at all. In Keiser's text, the offering is on days 5, 6, 10, 14, 17 (double), 21,



23, 25, 28. Therefore Dr. Keiser's text gives us another argument for refusing to accept Clay's theory of a Babylonian sabbath.

From the point of view of a Bible student, we also note in a letter (No. 23, 18) the name Ja-ga-bu-u (Jacob). Cf. Index, p. 17.

Dr. Keiser's work deserves the highest praise. The autographed texts are excellent. The indices are exhaustive. There are only a few blemishes. On p. 15, we would prefer *Dañan* to the Teutonic spelling *Dajan*, which is not consistent with the transliteration *ia* for the possessive pronoun of the first person as used by Keiser himself in the same column (sub voce *Beli-ia*). On p. 34, in the Index of names of deities add <sup>d</sup>*Dan-nu*, see name with <sup>d</sup>*Dan-nu* —.

We hope that Dr. Nies will make accessible to scholars other parts of his large collection. He is to be congratulated on making choice of an editor as well qualified as Dr. Keiser.

JOHN A. MAYNARD.

*The Empire of the Amorites.* By Albert T. Clay. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919, pp. 192.

In this book we have the sixth volume of Researches in the Yale Oriental Series. Just as Sayce and Wright had called attention to the forgotten empire of the Hittites so Clay wishes to unearth an Amoritic empire. It is a subject which has occupied the author's mind for many years. Already in his *Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites*, Professor Clay sought to show that the culture of the Semitic Babylonians had had a long development in the land of the Amorites before it had been carried into Babylonia. In the work before us, the author goes a step farther, and accumulates a mass of evidence to prove that the home of Semitic culture was not originally Arabian, nor even Babylonian, but Amoritic. In his first chapter, he discusses the Home of the Semites, and locates it in Amurru. Not only were the rulers of the First Babylonian Dynasty Amorites, but the Habiri of the Amarna Letters also came from that region. He goes on to show that the Babylonian and Assyrian language came from Amurru; that the Sumerian laws were Amoritic in origin; that the cities Ur and Harran were Amoritic; that the deities Anu, Anti, and Ishtar (whom he calls Ashirta) were Amoritic; and that names of temples, gods, and individuals in Sumerian garb, if examined carefully, will also turn out to be Amoritic. In a chapter

on Egypt and Amurru, he seeks to show that Retenu was the Egyptian name for northern Amurru, and that the Egyptian sun-worship was northern Semitic. In short, Professor Clay claims an Amoritic origin for a large share of the ancient culture of the Nearer Orient.

One must admire the skill and industry with which Professor Clay maintains his thesis, and no one can write on the subject of Semitic origins without taking this work into most serious account. But until future excavations are made in Syria, it is not likely that the theory of a vast and cultured empire of the Amorites will be generally credited, especially as our information is at present so meagre. Nor will the shifting of the site of places, like that of Harran to the north of Mesopotamia, without detailed proof, be readily accepted. However, Professor Clay is a pioneer, and whatsoever he has to say on Semitic culture, will always be eagerly studied.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

*La Chronologie des Dynasties de Sumer et D'Accad.* Par F. Thureau-Dangin. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1918, pp. 67.

This study consists of two parts, one about the chronology of the Dynasty of Larsa, already published in RA 15, 1; and the other about the chronology previous to the Dynasty of Isin. In the first part Thureau-Dangin translates and transliterates an important tablet, which is now in the Louvre (AO 7025), and which, with a few lacunae, gives a full chronology of the Dynasty of Larsa. The lacunae are filled in from contracts and from an inscription published a few years ago by Clay, in his *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Collection*. After full notes and discussions, a Synchronistic table of the three dynasties of Larsa, Isin, and Babylon is drawn up, in which, it is interesting to note, the author places the beginning of the First Babylonian Dynasty in 2225, and shows that Hammurapi began his reign in 2123. He synchronizes Hammurapi and Rim-Sin by showing that the former defeated the latter in the thirtieth year of Hammurapi's reign.

In the second part Mons. Thureau-Dangin rejects the date attributed by the scribes of Nabonidus to Naram-Sin, and accepts the belief that the scribes mistook 3200 for 2200, placing Naram-Sin at 2755 and Sargon at 2845. Nor was Naram-Sin the actual son of

Sargon, for three kings intervened, namely, Maništusu, Šarrum- [ . . . ], and Uru-Muš. He shows that the chronology can be safely carried back to Lugalzaggisi, 2870. For students of Babylonian religion, an interesting point comes out in AO 7025, namely, that the election to the high-priesthood was often effected by means of oracles.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

*Goucher College Babylonian Collection.* By Raymond P. Dougherty. Baltimore: Goucher College, 1918, pp. 8.

This is a brief and interesting sketch of an important collection of Babylonian tablets. There are 924 tablets, all of which belong to the Neo-Babylonian and Persian periods, except 61 which are in the Sumerian language and belong to the Hammurapi dynasty. Goucher College is to be congratulated upon the acquirement of a splendid collection of tablets which will be classed with such collections as those at Yale, the University of Pennsylvania, Haverford College, Smith College, and with the J. P. Morgan and Nies Collections. Professor Dougherty transliterates and translates one of the tablets. It refers to "Belshazzar, the Son of the King."

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

*The Annals of Thutmosis III (Early Egyptian Records of Travel, Vol. III).* By David Paton. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1918, sec. 1 and 2, pls. 108. \$15.00.

In these two fine volumes Mr. Paton has again made all students of Egyptology his debtors. He has continued his *Materials for a Historical Geography of Western Asia* in this work, and has performed his task in his same exhaustive and painstaking way. In this part of his work the Annals of Years XXII to XLII are transliterated, translated, and discussed. He follows the plan of the preceding volumes, giving, first of all, a full account of the text to be studied; then, a complete bibliography of the text; and finally, a transliteration and translation. The whole text is fully discussed and numerous drawings and diagrams are inserted. At the extreme right of the page is a column containing the geographical names occurring in the text.

The plan of the work is most detailed and elaborate. Perhaps it



is too detailed. For example, there is a double transliteration of each text, the first giving references to the individual signs. This seems, to the reviewer, hardly necessary, since experts know the signs, and beginners would not use such a work for reading exercises. The second transliteration is sufficient. Further, the bibliography seems to be overdone, in that many out-of-date books are included, that might be entirely omitted. There are quite a number of misprints, such as *d* for *d* in line 1, page 15; *w* for *a* in âḥāa, line 9, page 17, Gissen *for* Giessen and uber *for* über on page 32, and Tel *for* Tell, page 96, but these are excusable in a work of so much detail. Nor are they of great importance, for the second transliteration usually gives the correct form.

This work is a monument to the learning and patience of Mr. Paton. It is a mine of useful information and an accumulation of Egyptian learning which is very hard to parallel. In discussing the texts, all kinds of subjects are studied and illustrated; for example, the ten varieties of grain, pages 40-41, are studied in great detail. Very often illuminating comments are made, which show wide reading and a thorough grasp of the subject under consideration. A series of eight appendices on the *âš*-tree, the *kftw*-ships, the *kpnwt*-ships, the *didw*, "costly stones," "Complaint of a peasant," "The Hearst Medical Papyrus," and the *bīa*-vessels, are done in the same detailed and careful manner. Finally, an Index of Texts, Papyri, geography, authors, a list of Booty, and special subjects, is appended. The only thing lacking seems to be a full index of all words discussed in the volume. This would be most helpful for reference.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.









JOURNAL OF THE  
SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

